

I have introduced legislation to repeal the airline tax in last year's budget bill. The highway bill, as I indicated, provided Hawaii with \$135 million in annual formula grants and will fund numerous priority projects. Money will be coming in, for example, to help needed improvements in Honolulu's harbor.

I will continue to call on Congress to pass funding for the International Monetary Fund. It is all too evident to the people of Hawaii that when the Asian economies suffer, the economy of our State suffers just as greatly. I might add by extension, Mr. Speaker, the mainland as well.

We should send this money because it is the right thing to do and because anything that stabilizes the Asian economies will help increase tourism and help to stabilize our own economic progress throughout the United States.

We must also focus on securing long-term solutions to our problems, improve our education for our children, higher medical care reimbursement. In Hawaii's case, I am helping to diversify Hawaii's agriculture and to upgrade the Pacific Missile Range Facility to help bring Hawaii's military facilities, which I have mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, into the 21st Century.

I also want to upgrade Hawaii's telecommunications links to the mainland and the world.

Tourism, the military and agriculture will continue to be Hawaii's key industries in the next century. We must, however, be well prepared to guide the changes underway. In the long run, technology development and innovation, as well as diversity within those industries, will lead us back to economic growth, jobs and prosperity. We must make wise decisions in this time of economic crisis.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to resolve Hawaii's economic problems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BOEHLERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WALSH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we have had quite a loud and lively debate here today about campaign finance. I for one think that that debate is healthy. Anyone watching this debate would see that there are very deep feelings about this issue. I think that all sides are speaking from the sincerity of their beliefs.

There are a lot of confusing issues on this issue of campaign finance. I for one do not think simply calling something reform means that that is going to make it better. In fact, some people would say that instead of campaign finance reform, this should be called campaign finance regulation.

In the definitions of campaign finance, we talk about hard money, we talk about soft money, we talk about independent expenditures, we talk about issue advocacy, we talk about a lot of magic words that a lot of people really do not focus on, do not understand.

I noticed that, during the debate today, that the minority leader referred to independent expenditures as being a real problem as someone else referred to independent expenditures as being a real problem. I do not really think independent expenditures are a real problem, because independent expenditures is express advocacy and already comes under FEC jurisdiction except in a few minute exceptions.

But if a person donates money to a candidate, and the candidate decides to give that money, let us say, to a not-for-profit group, there are some provisions in here, the Shays-Meehan bill, that would prevent, for example, political parties giving money to 501(c)(3) organizations or nonprofit organizations.

I for one think that political parties have a right to give money to nonprofit groups and allow them to get their message out on issues that are important to them. Issue advocacy was the real issue that brought us this whole debate to the House floor, because during the 1996 Presidential election, the Clinton/Gore campaign and the Dole campaign went farther than anyone had ever gone in raising soft money for issue advocacy by the political parties.

The only reason that there was difficulty with that is because a lot of foreigners made contributions to some of these political campaigns, and that is illegal under existing law. Section 441(e) of the Federal election law already makes it illegal for a foreigner to contribute to a political campaign.

Not only that, but also we know for a fact that, at the Buddhist Temple

fund-raiser, many individuals were listed as contributing hard money supposedly to a campaign, and then we subsequently found out that they did not actually contribute, but money came from foreign sources. So I would simply submit that we already have legislation on the books that can deal with the foreign money issue.

Now, another issue that is disturbing to many of us is the fact that some of these bills expand the definition of express advocacy. What that means is that, if you use express advocacy, you are expressly advocating the election or the defeat of a particular candidate. If you do that, then you have to file all the reports with the FEC. You have to meet the contribution limits and so forth.

I for one think that we have an opportunity in this debate that is I suppose to begin tomorrow to address some very serious issues, very serious constitutional issues regarding these pieces of legislation.

I know that tomorrow it will probably be another heated debate, but, as I said in the beginning of this statement, I know that both sides are approaching it with sincerity in their beliefs.

I see my time is about to expire, but I do look forward to the debate tomorrow.

SOFT MONEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I fully expected that we would be debating the rule on campaign finance reform at this time, but, unfortunately, there has been a delay. I do want to say that I think the debate today was enlightening at times, entertaining at other times. There were many Members of this body who have done great work on campaign finance reform, bipartisan work on campaign finance reform over the last 3 or 4 years: The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), people like the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), new members like the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAM SMITH), effective Members who have sat down to try to come up with a bill that is fair to both political parties. That is all we are trying to do here.

We do not have the perfect bill. We do not have the special magic wand that is going to make the system perfect. But let me tell you what we do

have. We have a bill the Democrats and Republicans have worked on in a bipartisan and bicameral way.

This bill is McCain-Feingold in the United States Senate, where Democrats and Republicans have been working together in that body. In fact, they, even when it came to a vote, got a majority of the Members of the other body to vote for the bill. Unfortunately, under Senate rules, they need a 60-vote majority to get by the filibuster.

In the House of Representatives, we have a golden opportunity. I have felt over the period of the last months more and more Members are willing to take on a special interest, fight for bipartisan campaign finance reform. The number of Members on both sides of the aisle committed to the Shays-Meehan bill has been growing every day.

I might add that it seems that every time the leadership on the other side of the aisle puts up another obstacle to passing true meaningful bipartisan campaign finance reform, it seems that we get more Members supporting our effort.

So I am not sure that the strategy to complicate the matter, the strategy to delay and procrastinate and capitulate, frankly, I do not think that it is working. In fact, more Members are supporting the Shays-Meehan bill today than have at any point in time over the last several years.

They have joined with editorial boards all across America, the Los Angeles Times, New York Times, U.S.A. Today, the Christian Science Monitor. They have joined with the League of Women Voters and Common Cause and Public Citizen and people in public interest groups who have been fighting to find a way to reduce the influence of money in American politics.

Critical to our proposal is making soft money illegal. I do not know how we could have spent millions of dollars over the last several months conducting investigations and having hearings, politically charged hearings about the abuses of soft money in the last Presidential election, and now we have an opportunity to have a bill that bans soft money, and the leadership is procrastinating, delaying, promising a vote, no vote, pulling rules.

Time and time again, you will hear opponents of reform argue that soft money is not a problem. Let us be clear. When they are defending soft money, they are really defending big money. That is where the American public clearly disagrees.

The soft money loophole allows corporations and labor unions to bypass Federal election laws and tap into their treasury accounts to funnel millions of dollars into the parties, money that is then spent to influence Federal elections.

The fact is that, as long as soft money is allowed, our campaign finance system will be the type of system that invites corruption. That is why we are trying to change this system.

The sham ads, issue ads, opponents of campaign finance reform tell us that we must protect free speech. But when they say free speech, they mean big money. The fact is that the Shays-Meehan bill does not ban any type of communication. It merely reigns in those campaign advertisements that have been masquerading as so-called issue advocacy.

According to the United States Supreme Court, communications that expressly advocate the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate can be subject to regulation.

The question is not whether the Federal Government should regulate campaign advertisement. It already does. The real question is whether or not the current test adequately identifies campaigns advertisements. The answer is simple. No, it does not. The Shays-Meehan bill will give us an opportunity to make these corrections.

CHINESE OCCUPATION OF TIBET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week we had a rally on the Capitol talking about freedom in Tibet, and there were a lot of people talking about the need to pray for the people in Tibet. I believe, though, that we need to worry about the people of America and America losing its way, turning its back on the very things that Thomas Jefferson and our founders believed in regarding freedom in this country and in this world, for the country that has been called the last great hope for a dying world has turned its back on freedom loving friends across the globe for 30 pieces of silver.

It seems Americans are confused by facts or more concerned about 9,000 points on the Dow Jones than what is going on. Nine thousand is a number that has mesmerized politicians in Washington. Nine thousand is a number that has mesmerized the wizards of Wall Street and those on Madison Avenue.

But when we are talking about Tibet, I think we need to talk about some numbers that at least, to me, and at least to the freedom-loving people of this country should be more important than the 9,000 number when talking about the Dow.

I am concerned about the number 50. That is the number of years Tibet will have illegally been occupied by China in the next few years. I am concerned about the number 1.2 million. That is how many Tibetans, one-fifth of the country's population, have died since 1959 because of the Chinese occupation.

I am concerned with the number 2,000. There are more than 2,000 political prisoners right now in Tibet. I am concerned about the number 130,000. That is how many Tibetans are in exile.

Right now, there are 250,000 Chinese troops occupying Tibet. At least 6,000

people were sentenced to death in 1997. Right now, 60, the count is 60 million for the number of people that this brutal regime has killed since its inception in 1949.

□ 1945

And yet we have politician after politician and corporate leader after corporate leader falling all over themselves to embrace China and, in doing so, crushing the human rights of those people in Tibet.

Freedom is what I believe America is about. Thomas Jefferson's view of America was an America with a free marketplace of ideas, where people could come together and talk about and debate and export liberty and freedom across the globe. And yet in America today we remain strangely silent because of our preoccupation with the Dow Jones over 9,000 points and our preoccupation over China as the next exporting market. And, meanwhile, we import from China and other places in east Asia, basically getting cheap consumer goods based on little more than what we in America would term slave labor.

It is very frightening. It does not remind me of the America that Thomas Jefferson and the founders talked about when they wrote,

We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are endowed with certain inalienable rights by their creator, and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Now, if our founders believed that God gave those rights to all men, are those rights that Jefferson wrote about, that the creator endowed us with, are those rights exclusive only to those people that are not good trading partners? Or if we have a good trading partner, do we turn our back on Jefferson's vision and our founders' vision of America in this world? Regrettably, over the last few years, I am afraid the answer is, yes, we have turned our backs. It is not the America that Jefferson believed in, it is not the America that leaders have believed in, it is not the America that I believe in.

So many people at the rally seemed concerned that they could not make a difference; that there was nothing they could do to break down the walls of resistance from the White House or from this Congress or from Wall Street or from Madison Avenue. But I am reminded of a quote that Bobby Kennedy made some 32, 33 years ago. And, of course, Senator Robert Kennedy was shot down about 30 years ago last week. But he believed that one person could make a difference. Just like he said in Johannesburg, one person could make a difference in breaking down the walls of oppression. I believe that to be the case in Tibet.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO ACT CREDIBLY WITH REGARD TO PROMISES TO REFORM CAMPAIGN FINANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). Under a previous order of the